

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | | |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|--|--|
| 10/829,230 | 04/22/2004 | Hideyuki Kinoshita | 26112 | 7134 | | |
| 20529 | 7590 10/19/2006 | | EXAM | EXAMINER | | |
| NATH & ASSOCIATES 112 South West Street Alexandria, VA 22314 | | | SHEWAREGE | SHEWAREGED, BETELHEM | | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| | | | 1774 | | | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 10/19/2006 | 5 | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|------------|--|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | | Application | on No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
| | | 10/829,2 | | KINOSHITA ET AL | L | | | |
| | | Examine | , | Art Unit | | | | |
| | | | Shewareged | 1774 | | | | |
| Period fo | The MAILING DATE of this communication a r Reply | appears on the | e cover sheet with the c | orrespondence ad | dress | | | |
| WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failui Any r | CRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING asions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior to to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state eply received by the Office later than three months after the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | DATE OF TH 1.136(a). In no ev lod will apply and w tute, cause the app | HIS COMMUNICATION ent, however, may a reply be timil expire SIX (6) MONTHS from lication to become ABANDONE | N. nely filed the mailing date of this co D (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | | |
| Status | | * | | | | | | |
| 1)⊠ | Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 | 7 July 2006 | | | 9 | | | |
| • | | | | | | | | |
| • | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | | | |
| | closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | | |
| | | n Expano Qu | 1400 0.5. 11, 40 | 0.0.210. | | | | |
| • | on of Claims | | • | | | | | |
| | Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | | |
| | 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>8</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | | |
| · | Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | | |
| = | Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | | | |
| 7) | Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | | |
| 8)□ | Claim(s) are subject to restriction and | d/or election re | equirement. | | | | | |
| Applicati | on Papers | | | | | | | |
| 9) 🗆 - | The specification is objected to by the Exami | iner. | | | | | | |
| · | The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ a | | Objected to by the E | Examiner. | | | | |
| | Applicant may not request that any objection to the | • | | | | | | |
| | Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corn | | · · | • • | R 1 121(d) | | | |
| | The oath or declaration is objected to by the | | | | • • | | | |
| Priority u | nder 35 U.S.C. § 119 | • | | | | | | |
| 12) 1 | Acknowledgment is made of a claim for forei | an priority un | der 35 II S.C. & 119(a) | -(d) or (f) | | | | |
| | All b) Some * c) None of: | gir priority and | der 00 0.0.0. § 110(d) | (d) or (i). | | | | |
| • | | ents have hee | n received | | | | | |
| | 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Stage | | | |
| | 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage | | | | | | | |
| * 0 | application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | | | | | | | |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Attachment | (s) | | | | | | | |
| | e of References Cited (PTO-892) | | 4) Interview Summary | | | | | |
| | e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | | Paper No(s)/Mail Da | | | | | |
| | nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date | | 5) Notice of Informal P | atent Application | | | | |
| -F-2. | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | , was | | | | | |

Application/Control Number: 10/829,230 Page 2

Art Unit: 1774

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's response filed on 07/27/2006 has been fully considered. Claims 1-8
are pending. (NOTE: Claim 8 is withdrawn from consideration as non-elected
invention). The Double Patenting rejections have been withdrawn in view of Applicant's
comments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

- 2. Claims 1-4, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kawatsu et al. (US 6,025,286).
- 3. A stencil sheet comprises a fibrous support and a layer of polyester film (abstract, background art and claim 1). The fibrous support is equivalent to the claimed fiber layer, and the layer of polyester film is equivalent to the claimed layer. A layer of silicone based release agent is coated on the layer of polyester film (col. 8, line 11). The melting point of the layer of polyester film is 230 degree C or lower (col. 3, line 53). With respect to the value of the ratio of storage modulus, basis weight value and air permeability value, it is elementary that the mere recitation of newly discovered function or property, inherently possessed by things in the prior art, does not cause a claim drawn to those things to distinguish over the prior art. *In re swinehart et al.*, 169 USPQ 226 at 229. Since the Kawatsu reference teaches all of Applicant's claimed compositional and positional limitations, it is inherent that the reference article function in the same manner claimed by Applicant. The burden is upon Applicant to prove that

Art Unit: 1774

the subject matter shown to be in the prior art does not possess the characteristic relied on.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's argument is based on the process of plate making of the master. This argument is not persuasive because the argument is directed to process limitation, while the claimed invention is directed to article. Applicant further argued that the claimed resin layer is different from the polyester film of the prior art because they have different property and function. This argument is not persuasive because ratio of storage modulus value, basis weight value and air permeability value are functional properties, and these properties are inherently possessed by the prior art. Applicant is advised to provide factual evidence to show that these properties cannot be possessed by the prior art. For the above reasons claims 1-4, 6 and 7 stand rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawatsu et al. (US 6,025,286).
- 6. Kawatsu does not expressly disclose a pore size value of the layer of polyester film. The experimental modification of this prior art in order to ascertain optimum operating conditions fails to render applicants' claims patentable in the absence of unexpected results. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to adjust the pore size in order to optimize ink permeability and

Application/Control Number: 10/829,230 Page 4

Art Unit: 1774

enhance print quality. A prima facie case of obviousness may be rebutted, however, where the results of the optimizing variable, which is known to be result-effective, are unexpectedly good. *In re Boesch and Slaney*, 205 USPQ 215.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's argument is based on that Kawatsu gives no motivation to adjust the pore size, because its thermoplastic resin film primarily has no pores in it. This argument is not persuasive because the polyester film of Kawatsu has inorganic particles and it is stretched during process of making the stencil; therefore, the polyester film of Kawatsu may comprise pores.

Conclusion

- 8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Betelhem Shewareged whose telephone number is 571-272-1529. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 8:00AM-4:30PM.
- 9. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye can be reached on 571-272-3186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/829,230

Art Unit: 1774

10. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

B.S. October 15, 2006.

PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 5